arXiv:hep-th/9202048v2 16 Feb 1992

Bloch electron in a magnetic field : diagonalization of tight-binding models

Alexander Moroz†

Institute of Physics ČSAV
Na Slovance 2
CS-180 40 Prague 8, Czechoslovakia

ABSTRACT

A connection of a variety of tight-binding models of noninteracting electrons on a rectangular lattice in a magnetic field with theta functions is established. A new spectrum generating symmetry is discovered which essentialy reduces the problem of diagonalization of these models. Provided that one knows one eigenvector at one point in the parameter space of the corresponding Harper equation one knows an eigenfunction of the corresponding model in the whole range of momentum singlet out by the Landau gauge.

The classical problem of Bloch electrons in magnetic fields has been studied by many authors [1], however, despite some general rigorous results about the spectrum of the problem [1, 2] the analytic expressions for the energy spectrum and wave functions are still unknown. In what follows a whole variety of tight-binding $(t-b)$ models of noninteracting electrons in a magnetic field is discussed. We shall start with a rational magnetic field, $\alpha = p/q$, describe symmetries of these models and establish a connection with theta functions with chracteristics [3]. In our construction the whole symmetry of the Hamiltonian of $t-b$ models is used which is the invariance under continuos magnetic translations (MT's), i.e., under an action of the full Heisenberg group - a fact which has been ignored in previous discussions of the problem [1, 2]. The use of theta functions is then natural since they arise in connection with representations of finite dimensional subgroups of the Heisenberg group [3] which are relevant for a description of the spectrum of the Bloch electron. The ordinary theta functions have appeared in the study of a related problem [4], however, so far as we know nobody applied theta functions with characteristics to the study of the spectrum of $t-b$ models [5]. The problem of diagonalization of these models or the problem of solving a polynomial equation [1] is then reduced to one point of the Brillouin zone (BZ) for the momentum singlet out by the Landau gauge. This is shown by using *modular transformations*, $SL(2,Z)$ [3].

Let us start with some definitions. In what follows the Landau gauge $\vec{A} = B(-y,0,0)$ and a substrate potential periodic under translations by $\vec{a_1}$ and $\vec{a_2}$ in x and y direction, respectively, are assumed. A truncation of the Fourier cosine expansion of the substrate potential accomapanied with the Peierls substitution then leads on the Hamiltonian of a $t-b$ model [1] including in general terms describing j-th-nearest-neighbour hopping up to $j \leq n$,

$$\mathcal{H} = t_1(S_{\vec{a_1}} + S^*_{\vec{a_1}} + S_{\vec{a_2}} + S^*_{\vec{a_2}}) + \ldots, \tag{1}$$

where $S_{\pm\vec{a_\ell}}$ ($S_{-\vec{a_\ell}} = S^*_{\vec{a_\ell}}$) is a shift operator, $S_{\pm\vec{a_j}} = e^{\pm\frac{i}{\hbar}a_j m\hat{v}_j}$, $\hat{v}_j$, $j = 1,2$, being components of the standard velocity operator, and $\ldots$ in (1) stands for integer powers j of the shift opertors multiplied by a corresponding overlap integral t_j and describing next-nearest-neighbour hopping, etc. Action of

$S_{\pm\vec{a_j}}$ on a function $\psi(\vec{r})$ is given as follows,

$$\begin{array}{rclcl} S_{\pm\vec{a_1}}\psi(\vec{r}) & = & e^{\pm\frac{i}{\hbar}a_1(\hat{p}_1+\frac{e}{c}By)}\psi(\vec{r}) & = & \psi(\vec{r}\pm\vec{a_1})e^{\pm 2\pi i\alpha y/a_2}, \\ S_{\pm\vec{a_2}}\psi(\vec{r}) & = & e^{\pm\frac{i}{\hbar}a_2\hat{p}_2}\psi(\vec{r}) & = & \psi(\vec{r}\pm\vec{a_2}), \end{array} \tag{2}$$

where according to Ref. [1] $\alpha = \Phi/\Phi_o$, Φ and $\Phi_o = hc/e$ being the magnetic flux through an elementary plaquette and the flux quantum, respectively. Although recently a paper appeared where the use of the Peierls substitution is shown to lead to incorrect conclusions for total energy of electrons in a magnetic field [6], single electron energies are not affected (after some shift and rescaling) by this substitution [7]. The displayed part of the hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ which is the Hamiltonian of the nearest-neighbour $t-b$ model leads on the so-called Harper equation (HE) [1],

$$(\mathcal{H}u)(n) = u(n+1) + u(n-1) + 2\cos(2\pi\alpha n + \Theta)u(n) = Eu(n). \tag{3}$$

Here $u(n) = g(n)$, where $g(n)$ enters a parametrization of the wave function: $\psi(ma_1, na_2) = e^{ik_1 m}g(n)$, k_1 being component of the Bloch momentum, and $\Theta = k_1 a_1$.

Commutation relations for the components of the velocity operator in a magnetic field imply the following commutation relations for the shift operators $S_{\pm\vec{a_j}}$, $j = 1, 2$,

$$S_{\vec{a_1}}S_{\vec{a_2}} = S_{\vec{a_2}}S_{\vec{a_1}}e^{-2\pi i\alpha}. \tag{4}$$

By a simple consideration one finds that $1/\alpha$ roots (powers) of the shift operators, i.e., the Azbel operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ [1], $\hat{A} := S_{\vec{a_1}}^{1/\alpha}$, $\hat{B} := S_{\vec{a_2}}^{1/\alpha}$, commute with the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$. In contrast to the shift operators their commuation relation is

$$\hat{A}\hat{B} = \hat{B}\hat{A}e^{2\pi i/\alpha}. \tag{5}$$

The above defined operators are not the only ones which commute with $\mathcal{H}$. One can choose for generators of operators commuting with $\mathcal{H}$ components of the velocity operator transformed under spatial parity. Indeed working in the above Landau gauge one can check that any of the two operators from the set $\{\hat{p_1} + \frac{e}{c}By, \hat{p_2}\}$ commutes with both operators from the set $\{\hat{p_1},\ \hat{p_2} + \frac{e}{c}Bx\}$ and vice versa. Hence, the operators $T_{\pm\xi\vec{a_j}}$, $j = 1, 2$, called operators of magnetic translations (MTO),

$$T_{\pm\xi\vec{a_1}} := e^{\pm\xi\frac{i}{\hbar}a_1\hat{p}_1}, \qquad T_{\pm\xi\vec{a_2}} := e^{\pm\xi(\frac{i}{\hbar}a_2\hat{p}_2 + 2\pi i\alpha x/a_1)}, \tag{6}$$

commute with $\mathcal{H}$ for any ξ. One can justify that the spatial parity transformed components of the velocity operator are not gauge equivalent to the primary ones (the model under consideration is not (except for $\alpha = 1/2$) parity invariant), and hence MTO's are independent of the shift operators, as well as of $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$. Whenever ξ is an integer we shall call MTO's as the lattice or integer MTO's. The lattice MTO's form a projective (ray) representation of the translation group. For any α:

$$T_{\vec{a_1}} T_{\vec{a_2}} = T_{\vec{a_2}} T_{\vec{a_1}} e^{-2\pi i\alpha}, \qquad T_{\vec{a_1}} T_{\vec{a_2}} = T_{\vec{a_1}+\vec{a_2}} e^{i\pi\alpha}. \tag{7}$$

Therefore, in virtue of (5,7), as a maximal set of commuting operators can be taken any set of the form

$$\{\mathcal{H}, \hat{A}^{\rho_1}, \hat{B}^{\rho_2}, T_{\sigma_1\vec{a_1}}, T_{\sigma_2\vec{a_2}} \mid \rho_j \in Z,\ \rho_1\rho_2 \sim \alpha;\ \sigma_j \in R, \sigma_1\sigma_2 \sim 1/\alpha;\ j = 1, 2\}. \tag{8}$$

In a rational magnetic field $\alpha = p/q$, p and q being relative prime integers, one can always set $\rho_1 = 1,\ \rho_2 = p,\ \sigma_1 = 1,\ \sigma_2 = q$. Note that the "minimal"commuting MTO's are $T_{\vec{a_1}}$ and $T_{q\vec{a_2}/p}$ in this case. However, $T_{q\vec{a_2}/p}$ doesn't relate points which are related by $\mathcal{H}$ and hence is unimportant for the classification of the spectrum of $\mathcal{H}$. As a whole $t - b$ models have more symmetry than the model described by the Hamiltonian $H = (1/2m)(\vec{p} - \frac{e}{c}\vec{A})^2 + V(\vec{r})$, with a general substrate potential $V(x, y)$ periodic under translations by $\vec{a_j}$. $\mathcal{H}$ is invariant under continuos MT's (if considered in a suitable Hilbert space (see below)) while H only commutes with the lattice MTO's [8] which imply the following periodicity conditions for an eigenfunction $\psi(\vec{r})$ of H,

$$\psi(x \pm a_1, y) = \psi'(x, y), \qquad \psi(x, y \pm a_2) = \psi''(x, y) e^{\mp 2\pi i\alpha x/a_1}, \tag{9}$$

ψ' and ψ'' being from the same degenerate set as ψ.

Moreover, apart continuos MTO's, H does not commute with the operators $\hat{B}$ and $\hat{A}$. Therefore the procedure which leads on the $t-b$ Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ give a more symmetric Hamiltonian than the primary one. This is why, as we shall see, the problem of finding the spectrum of $\mathcal{H}$ for a given crystal momentum $\vec{k}$ and a given magnetic field can be essentially reduced. However, a crucial difference between finite-order differential equation and finite-difference equation (i.e., infinite-order differential one) should be noted. The additional symmetries of $\mathcal{H}$ with regard to H don't lead to any additional

degeneracy of energy levels since they don't relate points which are related by the Hamiltonian. The additional symmetries result in that we have a continuous family of equivalent Hilbert spaces associated with a fixed lattice. They differ each other by the boundary conditions imposed (see below; for a similar case see [9]). Therefore, in a rational magnetic field $\alpha = p/q$ the spectrum of either $\mathcal{H}$ or H can be classified by irreducible representations of the magnetic group or by a discrete subgroup of the Heisenberg group generated by $\{T_{\vec{a_1}}, T_{q\vec{a_2}}\}$, respectively [10]. Action of $T_{\vec{a_2}}$ which is not in a commuting set (8) then leads to a q-fold degeneracy of energy levels which implies the well-known Diophantine equation for the Hall conductance σ [11], $p\sigma + qm = 1$, m being an integer. Irreducible representations of the magnetic subgroup are one dimensional and can be classified by quasi-momenta $\vec{k}$ which take on the values in the first magnetic BZ (MBZ). Since the spectrum of either H or $\mathcal{H}$ is periodic under translations $\alpha \to \alpha \pm 1$, it will be assumed that $\alpha \in [0, 1)$.

The Heisenberg group G, which is nothing but the central extension of the group of ordinary lattice translations, can be defined as a set of elements $\{(\lambda, a, b)|\lambda \in C^*; a, b \in R\}$ with the multiplication law: $(\lambda, a, b)(\lambda', a', b') = (\lambda\lambda' e^{-2\pi i(ba' - b'a)}, a + a', b + b')$, where C^* is a unit circle in the complex plane. Let us denote by $q\Gamma$ a discrete subgroup of G, $q\Gamma := \{(1, qa, b)|a, b \in Z\}$. We shall denote by V the Hilbert space of entire functions $f(z)$ with the norm induced by the scalar product,

$$||f||^2 = \int \exp(-2\pi y^2/Im\tau)|f(x + iy)|^2 \, dx \, dy, \tag{10}$$

where the integral is taken over the elementary periodicity domain, τ being a modular parameter (modulus). Let V_q be a subspace of V invariant under $q\Gamma$. The action of $(1, qa, b) \in q\Gamma$ on $f(z) \in V_q$ is given as usual, $(1, qa, b)f(z) = e^{\pi i b^2 \tau + 2\pi i b(z+qa)} f(z + qa + b\tau)$, and $f(z) \in V_q$ if and only if $f(z) = \sum_{n \in (1/q)Z} c_n \exp\{\pi i n^2 \tau + 2\pi i n z\}$, with $c_{n+1} = c_n$, i.e., V_q is a $q-$dimensional (complex) subspace of V. Then a discrete subgroup G_q, $G_q := \{(\lambda, a, b)|\lambda \in C_q^*, a \in Z, b \in (1/q)Z\}/(\text{mod } q\Gamma) = C_q^* \times Z/qZ \times (1/q)Z/Z$, C_q^* being the cyclic group of $q-$roots of 1, commutes with $q\Gamma$. Following readily arguments in [3] step by step one can show that the finite group G_q acts irreducibly on V_q. Moreover, one has even an analoque of the Stone-von Neumann theorem for discrete subgroups of the Heisenberg group [3] . Because of irreducibility the action of G_q on V_q determines a canonical basis for V_q and G_q acts in a fixed

way. The standart basis of V_q is given in terms of theta functions with upper characteristic $\ell\alpha$ (modulo a constant), where $\ell = 0, 1, \ldots, q-1$ [3]. For a given modulus τ let the complex variable z be defined by $z = z(\tau) := \tau\alpha y/a_2$ and let us consider x/a_1 as the lower characteristic of the modified theta function $g[^{\ell\alpha}_{x/a_1}](\tau|\tau\alpha y/a_2)$ defined as follows,

$$g[^{\ell\alpha}_{x/a_1}](\tau|\tau\alpha y/a_2) := e^{\pi i\tau y^2\alpha^2/a_2^2}\theta[^{\ell\alpha}_{x/a_1}](\tau|z(\tau)). \tag{11}$$

$\theta[^{\ell\alpha}_{x/a_1}](\tau|\tau\alpha\ y) \in V_\alpha$ is the usual Jacobi theta function with characteristics [3],

$$\theta[^{\ell\alpha}_{x/a_1}](\tau|\tau\alpha y/a_2) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\{\pi i\tau(n+\ell\alpha)^2 + 2\pi i(n+\ell\alpha)(\frac{x}{a_1} + \tau\alpha\frac{y}{a_2})\}. \tag{12}$$

In what follows we shall rescale our coordinates according to: $x_j/a_j \to x_j$. In the following step we shall introduce the momenta (k_1, k_2) and define functions $g^{k_1k_2}[^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y) := e^{ik_1x+ik_2y}g[^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$. Let us denote the Hilbert space of functions $g^{k_1k_2}[^{\ell\alpha}_{x}]$ with the scalar product (10) by W_α. For a given modulus τ the lattice MTO's (considered as a subgroup of the Heisenberg group) provide the unitary irreducible representation (UIR) of G_q in W_α, $G_q \ni (1, \pm 1, 0) \hookrightarrow T_{\pm\vec{a_1}}$, $G_q \ni (1, 0, \pm\alpha) \hookrightarrow T_{\pm\vec{a_2}}$. Note that in a rational magnetic field, $\alpha = p/q$, irreducible action of the lattice MTO's requires that the Hilbert space be specified by periodic boundary conditions (PBC) on the square defined by translations by q *lattice spacings in both directions* despite that already $T_{\vec{a_1}}$ and $T_{q\vec{a_2}}$ commute (7). The condition that a state $\psi(x, y) := \sum_\ell d_\ell g^{k_1k_2}[^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ is an eigenfunction of the rescaled Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}/t_1$ at the point (x_o, y_o) of the plane is tantamount to the condition that the q-dimensional vector $\vec{d} = (d_o, d_1, \ldots, d_{q-1})$ solves the HE,

$$e^{-iK_2}d_{\ell+1} + e^{iK_2}d_{\ell-1} + 2\cos[(K_1 + 2\pi\ell\alpha]d_\ell = \varepsilon d_\ell, \tag{13}$$

at $K_1 = k_1 + 2\pi\alpha y_o$ and $K_2 = k_2 - 2\pi\alpha x_o$, where $\varepsilon = E/t_1$. In the matrix notation the vector $\vec{d}$ has to be the eigenvector of the following hermitian

$q \times q$ matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} C_o & e^{-iK_2} & \dots & e^{iK_2} \\ e^{iK_2} & C_1 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & e^{iK_2} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & e^{-iK_2} \\ e^{-iK_2} & \dots & e^{iK_2} & C_{q-1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{14}$$

where C_ℓ stands for $2\cos(K_1+2\pi\ell\alpha)$. To show this one can use the behaviour of $g[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ under lattice translations,

$$\begin{aligned} g[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x\pm 1}](\tau|\tau\alpha y) &= e^{\pm 2\pi i\ell\alpha} g[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y), \\ g[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha(y\pm 1)) &= e^{\mp 2\pi i\alpha x} g[{}^{(\ell\pm 1)\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Note that for a given parameters (K_1, K_2) of the HE we have a *freedom* to choose (x_o, y_o) *at our convenience* since a change in (x_o, y_o) can be compensated by adjusting the values of the momenta (k_1, k_2). Due to the periodicity properties (15) of theta functions the same HE (for a given momenta (k_1, k_2)) (13) will be repeated at the points of the lattice $(x_o + qm, y_o + nq)$, m and n being integers. Since, for a given (x_o, y_o),

$$\begin{aligned} g[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x_o+m\pm q}](\tau|\tau\alpha(y_o+n)) &= g[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x_o+m}](\tau|\tau\alpha(y_o+n)), \\ g[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x_o+m}](\tau|\tau\alpha(y_o+n\pm q)) &= e^{\mp iq2\pi\alpha x_o} g[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x_o+m}](\tau|\tau\alpha(y_o+n)), \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

basis functions $g^{k_1k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ satisfy *the same boundary conditions* (BC) on the elementary periodicity $q \times q$ square at any point of the $(x_o + m, y_o + n)$ lattice. This corresponds to the fact that these points are connected by the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ and states on this lattice belong to *the same* Hilbert space. Because of (16) any basis function carries an internal Bloch momentum $k_2 = -2\pi\alpha x_o y$ on the (x_o, y_o) lattice. Thus, the state $\psi(x, y) := \sum_\ell d_\ell g^{k_1k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ carries the Bloch momenta (k_1, K_2) on the (x_o, y_o) lattice. The Hilbert space on a given (x_o, y_o) lattice is determined by the scalar product

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle g^{k_1k_2}[{}^{s\alpha}_{x}]|g^{k'_1k'_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}]\rangle_{W_\alpha(x_o,y_o)} := \\ &\sum_{0\le m,n\le q-1} \overline{g^{k_1k_2}[{}^{s\alpha}_{x_o+m}](\tau|\tau\alpha y_o+n)} g^{k'_1k'_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x_o+m}](\tau|\tau\alpha y_o+n). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

One can check that $W_\alpha(x_o, y_o)$ is the Hilbert space, $\mathcal{H}$ is the hermitian operator, and that $g^{k_1 k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}]'s$ are orthogonal for a given (k_1, k_2), $\langle . \, [{}^{s\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)|. \, [{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)\rangle_{W_\alpha(x_o,y_o)} = q\delta_{s\ell}\sum_{n=o}^{q-1} \overline{g[{}^{n\alpha}_{x_o}](\tau|\tau\alpha y_o)} g[{}^{n\alpha}_{x_o}](\tau|\tau\alpha y_o)$ The notion of eigenfunction on a given lattice is selfconsistent since if $\psi(x,y) = \sum_\ell d_\ell(K_1, K_2) g^{k_1 k_2} [{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ is the eigenfunction of $\mathcal{H}$ at a given point of the (x_o, y_o) lattice that it *remains* to be eigenfunction of $\mathcal{H}$ for all points of (x_o, y_o) *lattice*. Indeed, at the point $(x_o, y_o + 1)$ one obtains the HE at $(K_1 + 2\pi\alpha, K_2)$. By using the periodicity properties (15) of the basis functions one can pull back the equation to the original point (x_o, y_o). The above statement will be then proved if one shows that $\psi(x,y) = \sum_\ell e^{-2\pi i\alpha x} d_{\ell-1}(K_1, K_2) g^{k_1 k_2} [{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ solves the HE at the above parameters at the original point (x_o, y_o). However, this can be checked rather straightforwardly. Similarly, at the point $(x_o + 1, y_o)$ one has to show that $\psi(x,y) = \sum_\ell d_\ell(K_1, K_2) g^{k_1 k_2} [{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ solves the HE at $(K_1, K_2 - 2\pi\alpha)$. This is equivalent to show that $\psi(x,y) = \sum_\ell e^{2\pi i\ell\alpha} d_\ell(K_1, K_2) g^{k_1 k_2} [{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ solves the HE at the above parameters at the original point (x_o, y_o). This can be again justified rather straightforwardly. Therefore any solution $d_\ell(K_1, K_2)$ of the HE defines eigenfunction $\psi(x,y) = \sum_\ell d_\ell(K_1, K_2) g^{k_1 k_2} [{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ of $\mathcal{H}$ in the whole continuous family of the Hilbert spaces of states on the (x_o, y_o) lattices if momenta (k_1, k_2) and the lattice (x_o, y_o) are adjusted such that the parameters (K_1, K_2) are kept fixed mod $2\pi\alpha$. The continuous MTO's can be viewed as operators which map states from one Hilbert space of states associated with a given lattice to another. By means of them one can put the eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}$ for different momenta (k_1, k_2) and, of course, for different (x_o, y_o) lattices, *on a given lattice*, i.e., to *the same Hilbert space*. Let us consider a state $\psi(x,y) = \sum_\ell \; d_\ell g^{k_1 k_2} [{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y) \in W_\alpha(x_o, y_o)$, i.e., the (x_o, y_o)-lattice section of W_α, with the components $d_\ell = d_\ell(K_1, K_2)$, which solves (13) for (K_1, K_2) at the point (x_o, y_o). Then $\psi' := T_{\epsilon_j \vec{a_j}} \psi \in W_\alpha(\vec{r_o} + \epsilon_j \vec{a}_j)$, $j = 1, 2$, satisfies a different BC and it is an element of $W_\alpha(\vec{r_o} + \epsilon_j \vec{a}_j)$. It ceases to be an eigenvector since its components d_ℓ have to satisfy the HE at $(K_1 + 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_2, K_2 - 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_1)$, i.e.,

$$e^{-i(K_2 - 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_1)} d_{\ell+1} + e^{i(K_2 - 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_1)} d_{\ell-1} + 2\cos(K_1 + 2\pi\ell\alpha) d_\ell = \varepsilon d_\ell. \qquad (18)$$

Thus, if we wish to make the property that some state ψ is an eigenfunction *invariant under continuous MT's*, $T_{\epsilon_j \vec{a_j}}$, we have to simultaneously transform either the components $d_\ell(K_1, K_2)$ according to $d_\ell(K_1, K_2) \hookrightarrow d_\ell(K_1 +$

$2\pi\alpha\epsilon_2, K_2 - 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_1)$, or the momenta (k_1, k_2) by the following rule: $(k_1, k_2) \hookrightarrow (k_1 - 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_2, k_2 + 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_1)$. First, let us consider the combined transformation (the shift by $T_{\epsilon_j \vec{a_j}}$ and the transformation of $d_\ell(K_1, K_2)$) by $U(\epsilon_1)$ and $U(\epsilon_2)$ separately. Therefore the MTO's don't commute in general the image of $\prod_{j_s} U(\epsilon_{j_s})$ (s being an index, one or two, which distinguishes between translations in x and y directions) is only defined modulo an overall phase factor. To get rid of it we shall define the operator $Q(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$,

$$Q(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) := [e^{i\vec{k}\vec{r}}(\prod_{j_s} T_{\xi_{j_s} a_s}) e^{-i\vec{k}\vec{r}}] \prod_{j_s} U(\xi_{j_s}), \tag{19}$$

where the both products are ordered in the same manner and $\epsilon_s = \sum_{j_s} \xi_{j_s}$. From the above it follows that $Q(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ defines a periodic function on the (m, n)-lattice, m and n being integers. Similarly we shall define the other combined mapping $R(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ (shift by $T_{\epsilon_j \vec{a_j}}$ and the transformation of momenta (k_1, k_2)) by $R(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$. The operators $Q(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ and $R(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ defines canonical mappings between different Hilbert spaces $W_\alpha(x_o, y_o)$ under which *eigenvectors are mapped on eigenvectors*. Thus we know that for any ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 both $Q(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)\psi_{(x_o,y_o)} := \sum_\ell d_\ell(K_1 + 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_2, K_2 - 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_1) g^{k_1 + 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_2, k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x+\epsilon_1}](\tau|\tau\alpha(y+\epsilon_2))$ and $R(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)\psi_{(x_o,y_o)} := \sum_\ell d_\ell(K_1, K_2) g^{k_1 k_2 + 2\pi\alpha\epsilon_1}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x+\epsilon_1}](\tau|\tau\alpha(y+\epsilon_2))$ are eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}$ at (x_o, y_o) if $\psi_{(x_o,y_o)} := \sum_\ell d_\ell(K_1, K_2) g^{k_1 k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ does so. By using the *modular transformations* we can explicitely write the induced change of the components d_ℓ down. Let us suppose that there exists a relation between our basis functions at different points (x, y) and $(\dot{x}, \dot{y})$, say

$$g^{k_1 k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y) = \mathcal{M}_{\ell s}(\tau|x, y) g^{k_1 k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{\dot{x}}](\dot{\tau}|\dot{\tau}\alpha\dot{y}). \tag{20}$$

Our main idea is as follows. Let us assume that there exists a *parametrization* of the components $d_\ell = F(\bar{d}_\ell)$ of a vector $\psi(x, y) = \sum_\ell d_\ell g^{k_1 k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ which exactly cancels the effect of $\mathcal{M}_{\ell s}(\tau|x, y)$ in the transformed basis under the action of $\mathcal{H}$. Then the condition that ψ is an eigenfunction on a given point (x_o, y_o) lattice is tantamount to the condition that both, d_ℓ and $\bar{d}_\ell$, solve the HE. However, the equation for d_ℓ is in general *at different point of the BZ* than the equation for $\bar{d}_\ell$. The parametrization then in turn induces a mapping between components of eigenvectors at these points of the BZ. In what follows we shall look for relations between our basis functions of the above type

(20). The simplest relations between the spectrum of $\mathcal{H}$ at different points of the BZ follow from the behaviour of $g^{k_1k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}]'s$ under lattice translations (15): $d_\ell(K_1,K_2)=e^{2\pi i\ell\alpha}d_\ell(K_1,K_2-2\pi\alpha)$ and $d_\ell(K_1,K_2)=e^{2\pi i\alpha x}d_{\ell-1}(K_1+2\pi\alpha,K_2)$. Since $g^{k_1k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha(y\pm 1/\alpha))=e^{\mp 2\pi ix}g^{k_1k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x}](\tau|\tau\alpha y)$ the action of $Q(0,\pm 1/\alpha)$ implies the relation $d_\ell(K_1,K_2)=d_\ell(K_1\pm 2\pi,K_2)$. Now we shall show that the required relation (20) is provided by *modular transformations* [3]. The modular transformations are transformations of the form,

$$\tau\hookrightarrow\dot{\tau}=\frac{d\tau+b}{c\tau+a},\qquad z\hookrightarrow\dot{z}=\frac{z}{c\tau+a},\tag{21}$$

the parameters a,b,c,d being integers, $ad-bc=1$, which form the group of modular transformations, $SL(2,Z)$. If the Jacobi theta functions with chracteristics are transformed under the modular transformation [3] then the transformation induces the following identity between the modified theta functions:

$$g^{k_1k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x+b\alpha y}](\tau|\tau\alpha ay)=(c\tau+d)^{-1/2}u_\ell e^{-i\pi ab\alpha^2y^2}g^{k_1k_2}[{}^{\dot{\ell}\alpha}_{\dot{x}}](\dot{\tau}|\dot{\tau}\alpha y),\tag{22}$$

where $\dot{\ell}\alpha=\ell\alpha d-cx+cd/2$, $\dot{x}=ax-b\ell\alpha+ab/2$, and u_ℓ is a phase factor which doesn't depend on τ and y. One of the key points in our construction is that the (finite dimensional) Hilbert space W_α constructed above *is not the unique choice*. By using the periodicity properties of modified theta functions (15) one can show that the representation space of the lattice MTO's (7) can be taken to be the Hilbert space generated by the modified theta functions from either right or left hand side of Eq. (22), as well. Of course, the parameters of the modular transformation (21) have to be such that $(a-1)$, $b\alpha$, and $(d-1)$ are proportional to q. Then, the contribution $-b\ell\alpha$ and $ab/2$ to $\dot{x}$ can be ignored, the upper characteristic remains rational (modulo a constant) and proportional to α, etc. Moreover, one can show that u_ℓ *doesn't depend* on ℓ in this case. One can also check that these modular transformations are not empty. One of them is, e.g., $a=(\bar{a}q^2+1)$, $d=(\bar{d}q^2+1)$, $b=\bar{d}q^2$, and $c=\bar{a}(q^2+k)$, whenever $\bar{a}+\bar{d}=k\bar{a}\bar{d}$.

Now, if one considers a vector $\vec{d}=\sum_\ell d_\ell(K_1,K_2)g^{k_1k_2}[{}^{\ell\alpha}_{x+b\alpha y}](\tau|\tau\alpha ay)$, then the condition that $\vec{d}$ is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{H}$ at (x_o,y_o) is tantamount to say that the components of $\vec{d}$ satisfy the Harper equation at $(K_1,K_2)\in$ BZ, where $K_1=k_1+2\pi\alpha y_o$, and $K_2=k_2-2\pi\alpha a(x_o+b\alpha y_o)$. Now, if one *parametrizes*

the components $d_\ell(K_1, K_2)$ of $\vec{d}$ according to $d_\ell(K_1, K_2) = e^{i\pi ab\alpha^2(y_o-\ell)^2}\bar{d}_\ell$ then one gets the HE for $\bar{d}_\ell$ at $(K_1, K_2 + 2\pi ab\alpha^2 y_o)$. The parametrization is taken to be such that it exactly cancels the effect of $e^{-i\pi ab\alpha^2 y^2}$ if one looks at the transformed basis (22). Therefore $d_\ell(K_1, K_2 + 2\pi ab\alpha^2 y_o) = e^{-i\pi ab\alpha^2(y_o-\ell)^2} d_\ell(K_1, K_2)$. Keeping (K_1, K_2) fixed and changing (k_1, k_2) and (x_o, y_o) one can distribute the eigenvector at $(K_1, K_2) \in \mathrm{BZ}$ throughout the whole range of K_2.

By close inspection one finds that the same construction can be done *for all $t-b$ models discussed here* (including asymmetric ones with direction dependendent overlap, $t_j^x \neq t_j^y$). This is a rather straightforward consequence of the invariance of $\mathcal{H}$ under the Heisenberg group. More detailed consideration of the above symmetry with regard to the diagonalization of $t-b$ models on a more general lattice and a consideration of the flux phases will be pursueded elsewhere.

I should like to thank D. Mumford for sending me a copy of his book. Discussions with J. Bellissard, F. Bien, and D. J. Thouless on the related problems, critical remarks by J. Fröhlich, as well as a financial support by the Deutche Forschungsgemeinschaft in an early stage of this work and the present support by the Swiss National Foundation are also gratefully acknowledged.

†Address after October 1, 1991: Theoretische Physik, ETH-Hönggerberg, CH-8093 Zürich, Switzerland

References

[1] P. G. Harper, Proc. Phys. Soc. Lond. A **68**, 874 (1955); D. R. Hofstadter, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 2239 (1976); Y. Hasegawa, P. Lederer, T. M. Rice, and P. B. Wiegmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 907 (1989); Y. Hatsugai and M. Kohmoto, Phys. Rev. B **42**, 8282 (1990).

[2] M. Ya. Azbel, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **46**, 929 (1964); J. Bellissard and B. Simon, J. Funct. Anal. **48**, 408 (1982); P. v. Mouche, Commun. Math. Phys. **122**, 23 (1989); M.-D. Choi, G. A. Elliott, and N. Yui, Invent. Math. **99**, 225 (1990).

[3] D. Mumford, *Tata lectures on theta I* (Birkhäser, Stuttgart, 1982), Ch.1, §3; D. Mumford, M. Nori, and P. Norman, *Tata lectures on theta III* (in print); J. Igusa, *Theta functions* (Springer, Berlin 1972), Ch.2, §5.

[4] F. D. M. Haldane and E. M. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 2529 (1985); R. B. Laughlin, Ann. Phys. **191**, 163 (1989).

[5] We have applied these functions to the nearest-neighbour TB model in our Max-Planck-Institute preprint, Münich, MPI-Ph/22-91 (unpublished). However, it contains an error which is corrected here.

[6] A. S. Alexandrov and H. Capellmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 365 (1991);

[7] A. S. Alexandrov and H. Capellmann, Aachen preprint RWTH/ITP-C 14/90.

[8] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics. Part 2. Landau and Lifshitz Course of Theoretical Physics. Vol. IX* (Pergamon Press, New York, 1980), §60.

[9] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2095 (1985).

[10] E. Brown, Phys. Rev. **133**, A1038 (1964); J. Zak, Phys. Rev. **134**, A1602 (1964), **134**, A1607 (1964).

[11] I. Dana, Y. Avron, and J. Zak, J. Phys. C **18**, L679 (1985).